



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON THE MANNER OF APPOINTING ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS IN IRELAND.

It is admitted by all Irish Roman Catholics that two different methods of choosing bishops are both equally compatible with full communion with the Church of Rome. One is, that the person who is to be made a bishop should be chosen in Ireland, and by Irishmen, and that the Pope should issue a Bull for the consecration of that person; the other is, that the Pope himself should choose whatever person he may please, and that no Irishman should have anything to do with the choice.

This is not a question of empty speculation; it is a practical and present question. Both methods are now before the Irish people. For the last thirty-five years, at least, Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland have always been chosen by the priests of the vacant diocese, who, of course, are Irishmen. The practice has been for the priests to choose three men, of whom the Pope appointed one; so that no man could be a Roman Catholic bishop in Ireland, unless elected by the priests of the diocese. But the Pope and the Court of Rome have lately set all this aside, and have determined to take the choice of Irish bishops into their own hands, and to let no Irishman, whether priest or layman, have anything to do with it. The great step was taken a very short time since, in the case of Dr. Cullen, now Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh. On the death of Dr. Crolly, his predecessor, the priests of the diocese of Armagh assembled according to custom, and elected three men for the Pope to choose out of. The Pope set aside the three names returned by the priests, and appointed, out of his own will and pleasure, Dr. Cullen, who was not one of the three. We believe that, in another case which has since occurred, the Pope has done the same thing, showing that it is the result of a deliberate plan and design.

Now, no Roman Catholic will say that the election by Irish priests, of those who were made bishops during the last forty years, was heretical or improper. The change, therefore, is not made on any Catholic ground, but on some ground or design than is purely *Roman*, and not Irish. It is not the Roman Catholic religion that required the change, but simply the policy and the designs of the *Court of Rome*.

No one can say that this is of no importance to the spirit of Irish nationality. So long as the heads of any clergy are elected by natives of that country, so long the clergy itself will partake of the national spirit. But so surely as the heads of a clergy are nominated by the arbitrary will and uncontrolled choice of a foreign power (and *Rome* is surely a foreign *country*) so surely will that clergy be divested of all national spirit, and will sink into mere tools of the power that names them.

We cannot suppose that the Pope intended to offer a needless insult to the spirit of Irish independence. This cannot be. There must be some deeper object at the bottom. We propose to show, from the history of all countries, and especially of Ireland, that it has ever been the settled policy of Rome to crush all exercise of national independence, all feeling of national spirit, in order that all may come to depend more entirely on Rome. We are not speaking now of religion, but of political and temporal control. So long as national feeling exists, so long Rome can never have the supreme control of the world which she once enjoyed, and still seeks to regain. We believe that a deep design has been laid, to subjugate all national spirit in Ireland, and to obtain for Roman agents the direction of everything in Ireland.

We appeal to daily events to confirm our view. The advantage which the middle classes may yet

derive from the Queen's Colleges has been rejected by purely *Roman* influence. Had the Irish priests of the diocese of Armagh been allowed to elect their own primate, those advantages would have been secured to the Irish Roman Catholic laity, and the colleges would have been gratefully accepted by the Irish Roman Catholic bishops themselves. But rejected they were by *Roman* policy. Then an Irish Catholic university was to be established, and funds were extracted from the starving Irish. Was that university to be more "national" than Dr. Cullen's appointment? Let the selection of a rector for it answer. Dr. Newman, an English convert, known to have published, since his conversion, opinions directly opposed to the Council of Trent, and to the teaching of Maynooth; but a great friend of Cardinal Wiseman. This appointment is published by Dr. Cullen in a letter to a French paper, the "Univers," with unbounded approbation. Again, a Catholic Defence Association was established in Dublin, a secretary was to be appointed, but "no Irish need apply." Mr. Wilberforce, another English convert, and personal friend of Dr. Wiseman, is appointed. Dr. Cullen, indeed, was ill, and could not be present (illness will happen sometimes inconveniently, sometimes not); but no one doubts that he was concurring in the plan. Within a few weeks we have seen a joint letter from several Irish parliamentary representatives, urgently remonstrating against this course, and indignantly reclaiming against it. The *Times*, and some other papers, have treated all this as if these Irishmen were merely gripping after the petty salary attached to the office. We entertain no such thoughts; we believe that these Irishmen see, like ourselves, that there is a deep-laid scheme to eradicate all feeling of Irish nationality, for the furtherance of the objects of Rome; and that Drs. Cullen and Wiseman are agents of Rome, specially selected for the work.

It may be asked, What all this is to us? and we are ready to answer the question. We are Irishmen in heart and feeling; ready and anxious to join, heart and hand, with all our fellow-countrymen, in the spirit of Irish nationality. We speak honestly, and faithfully, and kindly to our fellow-countrymen where we differ from them; but that does not make us less willing or less fit, but more willing and more worthy, to join them in Irish feeling. And when we see a large number of them, who differ from us in submitting to a foreign church, about to fall into a snare for increasing that subjection to an extent which they themselves must confess is not required by their own religious convictions, even to the extent of making their church an instrument of extinguishing in their breasts all feeling of national individuality and independence, we conceive we have a duty, arising from our common nationality, to ask them to resist the attempt. And we believe that they are ready to hear us. The proceedings we have referred to are not acceptable to the Irish laity. We appeal to the Irish members who signed the remonstrance against the appointment of Mr. Wilberforce; we appeal to the able articles against Dr. Cullen's anti-national spirit which have appeared in the leading provincial Roman Catholic journal of Ireland, the *Cork Southern Reporter*; we appeal to our countrymen in general, not to allow their national spirit to be brought into a bondage to Rome, which the Roman religion itself does not require. We believe that they will admit our appeal; and we shall in this, and our next number, proceed to show them, from Roman Catholic authorities only, how the policy of Rome has always been to take the management of all Irish affairs out of the influence of Irish nationality; and how intimately that policy has ever been connected with the method of electing those who are to be Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland.

We cannot suppose that the Pope intended to offer a needless insult to the spirit of Irish independence. This cannot be. There must be some deeper object at the bottom. We propose to show, from the history of all countries, and especially of Ireland, that it has ever been the settled policy of Rome to crush all exercise of national independence, all feeling of national spirit, in order that all may come to depend more entirely on Rome. We are not speaking now of religion, but of political and temporal control. So long as national feeling exists, so long Rome can never have the supreme control of the world which she once enjoyed, and still seeks to regain. We believe that a deep design has been laid, to subjugate all national spirit in Ireland, and to obtain for Roman agents the direction of everything in Ireland.

We appeal to daily events to confirm our view. The advantage which the middle classes may yet

HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE MANNER OF APPOINTING BISHOPS IN IRELAND.

All students of Irish ecclesiastical history agree in distinguishing *three* periods, which are most convenient for our inquiry:—

1. From the first spread of Christianity in Ireland to the Synod of Kells, A.D. 1152, at which the archbishops of Ireland first received bulls from Rome.

2. From the Synod of Kells to the Reformation, or separation of the Church of England from the Church of Rome.

3. From the Reformation to the present time.

In the first period, Ireland had one church, and one only; independent of Rome, though living often in friendship, but sometimes in discord with her.

In the second, Ireland had one church only, growing gradually more subject to Rome.

In the third, two rival churches have existed in Ireland—one independent of Rome, the other in a subjugation to Rome growing daily more total and hopeless.

One question is, How bishops were appointed in these various periods?

The first period we treat of solely by extracts from the writings of known Roman Catholic historians of the greatest credit, and the statements of Irish Roman Catholic bishops in late times.

1. Our first authority for the first period is the Irish History of Mr. O'Halloran—a man of learning and character, a strict Roman Catholic, and a great lover of Irish nationality.

He states (vol. iii., p. 13)—"At a very early period Christianity was preached in Ireland. The constant enmity between this country and ancient Rome prevented any kind of friendly intercourse. This doctrine came not immediately from thence here, but from the Churches of Asia." P. 18—"The political* enmity betwixt Rome and Ireland cut off all communication between them."

"The Irish received the faith from the early Asiatic or African churches; and Palladius was, therefore, the first bishop sent from Rome to establish the *Roman* hierarchy here."

(P. 23.) "Amongst the other causes of (Saint) Patrick's great influence on the people, one was, his attention to avoid whatever could alarm the national pride, or alter the established police (policy?) of the kingdom. As to the first, we find no hint at a foreign supremacy during the whole of his mission."

(P. 29.) "Christian bishops were appointed to succeed the Archdruids (the heathen priests before the conversion of the Irish), by those families only who, being converted, had a right to the nomination."

After speaking of the opposition of the Irish Church, in the seventh century, to the order of the Roman Church about keeping Easter, he goes on to say—

(P. 42.) "From this period to the middle of the twelfth century, Rome and Ireland had no connection or correspondence."

In pages 395 and 6, describing the state of the Irish Church in the beginning of the twelfth century, he says—"The power of nominating bishops to certain dioceses was reserved to certain royal and noble families in the different parts of the kingdom, and to them alone . . . It does not appear that the Popes ever enjoyed any direct power or authority whatever over that Church (the Irish) . . . No proof whatever can be produced that the Popes nominated to bishoprics amongst us."

Such is the testimony of Mr. O'Halloran concerning the first period of our inquiry.

If it can be shown that he was wrong in saying, that "No proof whatever can be produced that the Popes nominated to bishoprics amongst us," we suppose some one can produce such proofs relative to the period we are speaking of, and our pages are open to any one who can produce them, as we are only anxious to promote truth.

Our next witness is Dr. Charles O'Connor—a real Irishman of the old stock, and a Roman Catholic. He says, in a note to page 43 of his third letter from Columbanus ad Hibernos, "It will appear evident from the Irish Annals, as well as from the letters of the Ancient Fathers, published by Ussher, in his Sylloge; and from the Lives of Columba, by Adannian; and of Columbanus, by Jonas; that the Irish always appointed their own bishops, without so much as the knowledge of Rome."

Dr. O'Connor argues, that this must have been the practice in St. Patrick's time, from a letter written to the Bishops of Vienna and Narbonne, by Celestine, who was Pope at that time, in which Celestine says—"Observe the discipline of the church exactly . . . Let no bishop be imposed upon any person against their consent, but by the suffrages of the clergy, and the agreement of the gentry and people of the vacant See." Dr. O'Connor justly thinks, that a Pope who told the Gallic bishops that this was the "discipline of the church" could not have claimed to appoint bishops in Ireland.

* Rome conquered England by arms, but never conquered Ireland. But this so alarmed the Irish, for fear of their being brought into the same subjection, that they became very jealous of Roman influence. England, at the Council of Constance, in 1414, reaped an advantage from the ancient preservation of Irish independence, of which a short notice will be found in our present number.

This suggests to us another argument worthy of our notice. The canon law of the Church of Rome itself, for a thousand years, directs that *every bishop should be chosen in his own province*, and does not give the Pope any right of appointing bishops.

Our next witness is one above all objection. He is Peter Talbot, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin not 200 years ago—a predecessor of the late respected Dr. Murray.

The point we bring him forward to prove is not exactly the same which the last witnesses spoke to, but it is one which completes the subject. Mr. O'Halloran and Dr. O'Connor say, that the Pope did not appoint *Bishops* in Ireland up to the twelfth century. Archbishop Talbot undertakes to prove that the Pope did not make *Archbishops* in Ireland before that time.

The occasion of Archbishop Talbot writing was this—he claimed the primacy of all Ireland for himself as Archbishop of Dublin. Dr. Oliver Plunkett, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, wrote a book to prove that, as successor of St. Patrick, he was Primate of Ireland. Archbishop Talbot then wrote his book, called “*Primatus Dubliniensis*,” to support the claim of Dublin to the Primacy, which was published in 1674.

He begins by saying, “Primacy can be nothing else than ecclesiastical jurisdiction greater than that of an archbishop, conferred upon the prelate of any See or state by the Supreme Pontiff. . . . But that jurisdiction cannot be conferred otherwise than by giving the pall of that order.” (N.B.—The pall is a woollen garment made at Rome with some curious ceremonies; and the giving of it by the Pope is supposed to confer the authority of archbishop or primate.)

Having laid down this principle, which Roman Catholics cannot deny (though Protestants do deny it, on the ground that archbishops and primates were not made by the Pope at all in the early Church), Archbishop Talbot goes on to apply it (p. 10)†—“It appears, from St. Bernard, that the pall and primacy of St. Patrick was fabulous . . . for he says, in his Life of St. Malachy, that to the See of Armagh *the use of the pall, which is the fulness of honour, was yet wanting, and had been wanting from the beginning. And it seemed good in his eyes (Malachy's), if the Church for which he had laboured so much (Armagh, of which he was Archbishop), which hitherto had it not, should acquire it by his zeal and labour. And in section 16, he bore it sufficiently ill, that Ireland should, even as yet, be without the pall.* What, I beseech you, is the use of the pall, what the fulness of honour unless it be the jurisdiction of an Archbishop and the dignity of Primate? This was wanting from the beginning to the See of Armagh, and to all Ireland, as appears from the words of D. Bernard.”‡

This does not prove to *Protestants* that St. Patrick was not Archbishop and Primate of Ireland; because Protestants are content to follow the early Church, which had archbishops and primates, not made by the Bishop of Rome. But to Roman Catholics, who hold that no man can be a lawful archbishop or primate unless the Pope make him such by giving him the pall, the proof is conclusive that, on their principles, neither St. Patrick nor any of his successors, until 1152, were Archbishops of Armagh or Primate of Ireland. And it proves (what is our concern at present), by the testimony of St. Malachy, Archbishop of Armagh, and of St. Bernard, the last of the Fathers, both of whom lived at the very time, that, up to the year 1152, the Pope had never made an Archbishop or Primate of Ireland.

In page 17, Archbishop Talbot says—“St. Patrick himself never was Primate, nor even an Archbishop, since he had not the pall.”§

In page 41 he says—“I have consulted what authors I could, and I have considered the annals treating of that matter, and I here seriously declare, that I have fallen upon no author, worthy of credit, who produces even a probable conjecture, that ever, at any time, the See of Armagh obtained the Primacy of Ireland from the Apostolic See.”

Archbishop Talbot having thus settled the claim of Armagh to the Primacy, goes on to establish the claim of Dublin, in page 26—

“It remains that we should prove that the Dublin

* *Primatus nihil aliud sit, quam Ecclesiastica jurisdictione, Archiepiscopum major, a summo Pontifice concessa. Presuli alicuius sedis ac civitatis . . . Ea vero jurisdictione non aliter quam per ejus modi collationem Pallii concederetur.*

† *Constat ex D. Bernardo, Pallium ac Primatum Patricianum esse chim-ricum. . . . Alt enim in vita Sancti Malachie (s. 10) quod sedi armachano debeat adhuc, et defuerat ab initio. P.lli usus, quod est plenitudo honoris; et vi: non est bonum in oculis ejus (Malachie) si Ecclesia pro qua tantum laboraverat, quoniam hactenus non haberat, suo acquireret studio et labore, et sec. 16. Ego satis ferabam, Hibernian usque adhuc pallio caruisse. Quid queso Pallii usus? Quid Plenitudo honoris? Nisi jurisdictione Archiepiscopalis, dignitasve Primatis. Hæc defuit ab initio, sedi Armachano, tuncque Hibernie, ut pa: et ex verbis D. Bernardi.*

‡ D. Bernard is the St. Bernard called by Roman Catholics “the last of the Fathers.” He lived at the very time when the Pope first gave the pall to the Irish Archbishop, A.D. 1152. The words in italics are Talbot's quotation from St. Bernard; the rest is Talbot's own.

§ *Primas ipse St. Patricius nunquam fuit, immo nec Archiepiscopus cum Pallii caruerit.*

¶ *Consului quos potui auctores ac ea de re tractantes annales revolvi; et tamen post exactissimum scrutinium, serio hic modo testor, me in nullum incidisse auctorem fide dignum, qui vel probabilem conjecturam afferat, quod illo unquam tempore sedis Armachano Primatum Hibernie a sede Apostolica obtinuerit.*

pall was given by the Roman Pontiff to the city of Dublin, for this reason: because it was the chief or principal city, and the head of the kingdom of Ireland; and at that time, too, when a pall had never before existed in Ireland.”* And, then, he brings forward the pall given to Dublin at the Synod of Kells, A.D. 1152!†

Is it not enough to make an Irishman's blood boil in him to hear this Irishman, Peter Talbot, of an old, and honourable, and patriotic family in Ireland, this Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, deliberately maintaining that Ireland, the Island of Saints, never had an archbishop or primate until the year 1152? and that neither St. Patrick himself, nor any of his successors, ever was a lawful primate, or even an archbishop—simply because the Pope had never made him such—which is, indeed, true.

Yet this is what all Roman Catholics must now say, unless their pride in the ancient independence of Ireland be greater than their love of subjection to Rome.

This book of Archbishop Talbot's has been carefully suppressed of late years. A copy, in Marsh's Library, about twenty-five years ago, was supposed to be the only one in existence. It was stolen out of that library in the year 1828.‡

But where is the use of suppressing the book while its principles are maintained? Let Roman Catholics only avow that St. Patrick was, indeed, a lawful primate and archbishop of Ireland, by the laws of the ancient Church—although he was not created by the Pope—and then they may repudiate this book. But if they persist in making everything depend upon Rome, then they must repudiate St. Patrick as an archbishop, just as their own Archbishop Talbot did.

We have proved our first point—that no bishops nor archbishops in Ireland were made by the Pope up to the year 1152. We shall go on with the next period in our next number.

ANCIENT DIGNITY OF IRELAND.

THE following history (which we take from the Appendix to the General Council of Constance)† will be interesting to Irishmen, as showing the respect which was paid to the ancient dignity of Ireland.

We must explain, that there was an ancient custom in those councils, of voting by “Nations,” as it was called. Four “Nations” were acknowledged—viz., France, Spain, Germany, and Italy. These “Nations” were not “Kingdoms.” Each was a collection of several independent kingdoms. We have the lists; and we find that each “Nation” comprised six or eight kingdoms, whose governments were independent of each other.

At the Council of Constance, which was held A.D. 1414, the King of England claimed that the English should be acknowledged as a separate “Nation,” having a vote of their own in the Council. The King of France was very jealous at this, and ordered his ambassadors to protest against it in the Council: their protest is given in the appendix of the Council to which we have referred. The ambassadors of France insist, that England had always been reckoned part of the German “Nation” in all general councils; and they maintain that it ought to be so still; for, as England had only twenty-five bishops, it was absurd that so few should have a separate vote in the Council.

The ambassadors of the English King were heard in reply, and they do not deny either of the above statements: but they say, in answer to the fewness of their bishops, that the Irish, who had sixty dioceses, were united with them in the “Anglican Nation,” and taking in the Welsh, and some Scotch bishops, who joined with them, there were 110 bishops altogether. And in answer to the statement, that England had always been counted part of the German nation, and not a nation in itself, they do not deny it: on the contrary, they seem to admit that this was true; but then they quote St. Albert the Great and Bartholomæus as follows—“That the whole world being divided into three parts—viz., Asia, Africa, and Europe—Europe is divided into four kingdoms—first, the Roman; secondly, the Constantinopolitan; third, the kingdom of Ireland, which is now translated to the English; and fourth, the kingdom of Spain. From which it appears, that the King of England and his kingdom are of the most eminent and the most ancient kings and kingdoms of all Europe, which prerogative the kingdom of France cannot obtain.”

Such was the defence of the ambassadors of England. They did not rest their claim upon the rights of England itself, but on her inheriting the ancient rights of Ireland; and thus England obtained dignity in Europe and influence in Christendom, by her union with Ireland. For this defence having been heard by the Coun-

* *Reliquum est ut demonstremus Pallium Dubliniense concessum fuisse a Romano Pontifice civitati Dubliniensi, eo quod haec fuerit prima vel praecipua civitas; caputque Regni Hibernie. Et quidem tunc temporis cum nunquam ante in Hibernia Pallium exiit.*

† A copy (not placed in the catalogue) has been lately found in a press, in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. The managers of that library will do well to have it in safe keeping; there is no copy in the British Museum. One copy more is in private hands, from which our extracts are taken.

‡ Labbe and Cossart Concilia, vol. xii, col. 1727, et sequen. Ed. Paris, 1672.

cil of Constance, they decided that England and Ireland united should rank and vote as a separate nation, thus giving them an influence in the Council which the King of France sought to prevent, and which would have been wholly lost if England had stood alone. We observe, as an appropriate acknowledgment of their obligation to Ireland, that the “Anglican Nation” was throughout represented at that Council by “Patrick, Bishop of Cork.”

The rank assigned to Ireland among the kingdoms of Europe, in the above extract, may not appear so absurd if we reflect, that all the other kingdoms of modern Europe, which have any antiquity, arose out of the ruins of the Roman Empire, and can trace their origin no farther back than its decay; while Ireland, which had never been conquered by the Romans, could show the succession of her kingdom for ages before. This was, no doubt, the reason of the precedence assigned to her by St. Albert and Bartholomæus.

In the preface to Lynch's Feudal Dignities it is stated (p. 8), that the French rolls in the Tower contain enrolments of the proceedings, on behalf of England, at the Council of Constance.

Correspondence.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

WE have received the following communication, bearing the Enniscorthy post-mark. We thank our correspondent for it, and we print it with pleasure, conceiving it to be very deserving of a place in our pages. Of course, we think it also our duty, when inserting such communications, to make such observations as seem to us useful. Our correspondent will, we are sure, take this in good part; his object is evidently to promote fair and profitable discussion, and we give his communication *verbatim*:-

“15th February, 1852.

“SIR—I furnish you with the result of my reading, consequent on my receiving THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN, and earnestly hope my extracts may be useful to your end.—I am in charity, yours,

“A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

“When instituting this sacrament, our Lord himself, said—‘This is my body’—‘The bread I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.’—John vi. 52. ‘Unless you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall have not life in you.’—John vi. 54. You say, perhaps, this bread is no other than what is used for common food. Before consecration it is indeed bread; but no sooner are the words of consecration pronounced, than from bread it becomes the flesh of Christ.”—St. Ambrose, lib. 4, de sacr. c. 4, et c. 5.

“Whatever the Lord pleased, he hath done in heaven and on earth.”—Psa. cxxxiv. 6. Although the species of bread and wine are visible, yet faith tells us that, after consecration, the body and blood of Christ are alone there.”—St. Ambrose de consecr. dist. 2, c. omnia.

“Each receives Christ the Lord entire in each particle; he is not diminished by being given to many, but gives himself whole and entire to each.”—St. Augustine, de consecr. dist. 2, c. singulis.

“Take and divide it amongst you.”—Luke xxii. 17. You see how efficacious are the words of Christ; if, then, the word of the Lord Jesus is so powerful as to summon creation into existence, shall it not require a less exercise of power to make that subsist which already has existence, and to change it into another thing?”—St. Ambrose, l. 4, de sacr. c. 4.

“This change mocks the powers of conception, nor can we find any example of it in natural transmutations, nor even in the wide range of creation. The change itself is the object, not of our comprehension, but of our humble faith; and the manner of that change forbids the temerity of a too curious inquiry.”—Eccl. iii. 22. ‘No word shall be impossible to God.’—Luke i. 37.”

Our brother layman does not seem to disclaim the doctrine of transubstantiation, as stated in the article in our second number, to which he refers, and to which we now beg our readers to look back. He rather seems to admit it, and to justify it. We might prefer that he should have disclaimed the doctrine as there stated; yet we feel that the course which he has taken is one entitled to respectful consideration, because he appeals to the Scripture and to the early Fathers; and it is our sincere desire to discuss such arguments in a reverent and candid spirit.

Our correspondent quotes his Scripture proofs from the Douay Bible, at which we do not complain. He seems to use not the modern edition, which is approved by the present Roman Catholic bishops, but the first edition, published in 1582, or some other, which does not contain the modern alterations. We make no objection to this; only we beg of him to observe, that most of the notes in the early editions have been very properly omitted in that now in use.

Our correspondent seems to think that all the words which he quotes from St. John's Gospel were spoken by